

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION**

Vena Mizell, )  
Plaintiff, ) Civil Action No. 1:14-cv-04484-JMC  
v. )  
Commissioner of Social Security )  
Administration, )  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court for a review of United States Magistrate Judge Paige Gossett's Report and Recommendation ("Report"), filed on October 22, 2015 (ECF No. 15), recommending that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (the "Commissioner") denying Plaintiff's claim for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income be reversed and remanded for further administrative proceedings. The Report sets forth the relevant facts and legal standards which this court incorporates herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court, which has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made. Defendant notified the court that it would not be objecting to the Magistrate Judge's Report. (ECF No. 17.)

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198,

199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party’s waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court finds the Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law. The court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 15), **REVERSES** the final decision of the Commissioner denying Plaintiff’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income pursuant to sentence four (4) of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and **REMANDS** for further administrative proceedings.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



United States District Judge

November 19, 2015  
Orangeburg, South Carolina